# Reddie & Grose

16 Theobalds Road
London WC1X 8PL

Chartered Patent Agents
European Patent Attorneys
Trade Mark Agents

Telephone 071-242 0901
Fax 071-242 3290
Fax 071-242 0286
Telex 25445
DX 280

John H. Bass B.Sc.
P. Antony Smith M.A.
F.A.B. Valentine M.A.
Richard C. Abnett M.A.
Paul A. Brereton M.A.
Keith E. Geering B.A.
Nicholas S. Marlow B.Sc.
Linda J. Harland B.Sc.
J.M. Davies D.Phil
P.A.D. Lloyd B.Sc.

D.S. Jackson B.Sc.
J.J. Day B.Sc.

*Consultant*
David A. Pears M.A.



RECEIVED

JUL 16 1991

FISH & NEAVE
REFERRED TO JHI
NOTED BY


Jeffrey H. Ingerman, Esq.,
Fish & Neave,
875 Third Avenue,
New York,
N.Y. 10022-6250,
United States of America

JHB/JB/30591
8th July, 1991

Dear Jeff,

Philippine Patent Application No. 38977
Your File: PM-1322 (Philippines)
Our File : 30591

Further to my letter of 18th June, a further official action has been issued by the Philippine Patent Office and a copy is enclosed. The term 1B for reply will expire on 25th August 1991.

The present claims are objected to, and in particular claim 1 as originally filed, but that is largely because all the applications on this invention were filed with the same claims, which had been prepared on a more "worldwide" basis, whereas the Philippines follow U.S. practice quite closely.

The Examiner himself suggests that the wording of U.S. claim 15 be adopted as the wording of claim 1 for this application, and it appears that a reversion to the U.S. claims would avoid substantially all the objections. This is not entirely simple, however, because the two U.S. applications gave rise to two U.S. patents with somewhat parallel claims, whereas there is at present only a single combined application in the Philippines. Although it should be possible to restore a U.S. claim style to the claims of the single Philippine application, it might make more sense if the application were to be divided along the lines of the parent and CIP patents, but I am taking advice from our Philippine Associates.

Presumably you will have no objection to bringing the claims into line with those of the U.S. patents, but it would be helpful to know whether the client would agree to filing a divisional if this seemed to be the simplest way of dealing with an otherwise rather complicated situation.

Yours sincerely,

J. H. Bass

c.c. Beverly A. Monroe (Philip Morris Management Corp.) w/e


2026366792





Source: https://www.industrydocuments.ucsf.edu/docs/rlmj0000